

## **REMARKS**

Claims 1-17 are all the claims pending in the application.

### **I. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

A. The Examiner has rejected claims 1-8 and 11-16 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Alam et al. (U.S. 6,336,124) in view of Makipaa et al. (U.S. 6,556,217).

Claim 1, as amended, recites the features of a rule change instruction part operable to make an instruction for a change of rules to be applied when displaying the information; and a layout rule change part containing a plurality of predetermined layout rules, each of which defines a layout method for each type of the component elements of the information, and which are applicable to the component elements, the layout rule change part being operable to select one of the layout rules responding to the instruction from the rule change instruction part.

Applicants respectfully submit that the cited prior art fails to teach or suggest this combination of features.

Regarding Alam, Applicants note that this reference discloses a method of converting a document in an input format into a document in a different output format, wherein the supported input and output formats include formats such as HTML, XML and PDF (see col. 5, lines 29-35 and 51-53). The conversion between input and output formats is performed by first converting the input document into an intermediate format and then using the intermediate format to convert the document into an output format (see col. 6, lines 53-57).

As disclosed in Alam, the intermediate format includes a plurality of groups of characters, wherein each group of characters is stored as an intermediate format block (see col. 6, lines 53-54 and col. 7, lines 57-61). Each block may be an image, a paragraph, an element in a

table, or all or a portion of the table (see col. 7, lines 5-9). To process such blocks, an algorithm is provided for dividing a block into portions such that each portion is within a display parameter of a display configuration (see Fig. 19; col. 3, lines 57-60; and col. 17, line 1 - col. 18, line 36). Regarding this algorithm, Alam discloses that the rules for dividing the data are based on whether the data is arranged in a paragraph or a table, where rules may be set and applied to determine and remove excessive division of table cells (see col. 18, lines 25-26)

Regarding Makipaa, Applicants note that this reference discloses a method for displaying information which identifies a user terminal type and a screen size of the user terminal upon a logon of the user terminal (see col. 3, lines 16-18). Layout rules and typographical settings are then extracted based on this identified information, wherein the data can be resized such that it is able to fit on the screen of the user terminal (see col. 3, lines 18-28).

As noted above, claim 1 now recites the features of a rule change instruction part operable to make an instruction for a change of rules to be applied when displaying the information; a layout rule change part containing a plurality of predetermined layout rules, each of which defines a layout method for each type of the component elements of the information, and which are applicable to the component elements, the layout rule change part being operable to select one of the layout rules responding to the instruction from the rule change instruction part.

Thus, according to claim 1, each layout rule defines a layout method for each type of the component elements, wherein one of the layout rules is selected in response to an instruction from the rule change instruction part.

In the Office Action, the Examiner asserts that the rules for dividing the format blocks of Alam, as described in col. 17, line 1 through col. 18, line 36, correspond to making “an

instruction for a change of rules to be applied when displaying the information”, as recited in claim 1 (see Office Action at page 3). In addition, the Examiner also asserts that the intermediate format blocks of Alam correspond to the “component elements” as recited in claim 1 (see Office Action at page 3).

Regarding Alam, however, Applicants note that while this reference discloses layout rules for determining how to divide the data such that each portion of the data fits within the display configuration, each of the layout rules of Alam does not define a layout method for each type of the component elements, as recited in claim 1. That is, in Alam, while layout rules are provided for dividing the data so as to fit in a display configuration, a single layout rule of Alam clearly does not have the ability to define a layout method for each type of the component elements.

Further, regarding Maakipa, as noted above, this reference merely describes different layout rules based on the type of a user terminal. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that each of the layout rules of Maakipa clearly does not define a layout method for each type of component elements, as recited in claim 1.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that the cited prior art does not disclose, suggest or otherwise render obvious the feature of a layout rule change part containing a plurality of predetermined layout rules, each of which defines a layout method for each type of the component elements of the information, and which are applicable to the component elements, as recited in claim 1.

Moreover, as discussed above, according to claim 1, the particular layout rule that is applied is selected based on an instruction from the rule change instruction part. As noted above,

the Examiner has relied on Maakipa for the teaching of selecting a layout rule, and has relied on Alam for the teaching of making an instruction from a rule change instruction part.

However, assuming for the sake of argument alone that Alam and Maakipa are properly combinable, Applicants respectfully submit that the resulting combination would provide, at best, a system for converting a document from an input format (e.g., HTML) into an output format (e.g., XML), as taught by Alam, wherein the converted document could be modified based on a selected layout rule in order to be displayed on any type of user terminal, as taught by Maakipa.

Thus, as is clear from the above discussion, even if Alam and Maakipa were combined, the resulting combination would not provide a layout rule change part that is operable to select one of the layout rules responding to an instruction from a rule change instruction part, as recited in claim 1.

By providing a layout rule change part having layout rules which each define a layout method for each type of the component elements, as well as providing the ability to select one of the layout rules based on an instruction from a rule change instruction part, it is possible to provide a display device with the ability to change the layout of each of the component elements in response to the instruction from the rule change instruction part.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 is patentable over the cited prior art, an indication of which is kindly requested. Claims 2-8 depend from claim 1 and are therefore considered patentable at least by virtue of their dependency.

Regarding claim 11, Applicants note that this claim recites the feature of a user input process rule change part containing a plurality of user input process rules applicable to the user input, the user input process rule change part operable to select one of the user input process

rules according to the instruction from said rule change instruction part. Applicants note, however, that the Examiner has not addressed this feature in the rejection of claim 11.

In the Office Action, Applicants note that the Examiner grouped claims 1 and 11 together when formulating the rejection based on Alam in view of Maakipa (see Office Action at pages 2-5). Applicants point out, however, that the above-noted feature recited in claim 11 is not recited in claim 1. Further, Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of Alam and Maakipa fails to disclose, suggest or in any way render obvious such a feature.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that claim 11 is patentable over the combination of Alam and Maakipa, an indication of which is kindly requested. Claims 12-16 depend from claim 11 and are therefore considered patentable at least by virtue of their dependency.

Further, Applicants note claim 9 recites a similar feature regarding a user input process rule change part as is discussed above regarding claim 11. Accordingly, as the Examiner did not reject claim 9 based on the combination of Alam and Maakipa, but instead, rejected claim 9 based on Alam and Maakipa, and further in view of Thurlow (U.S. 6,057,841), Applicants believe that the Examiner may have inadvertently identified claims 11-16 as being rejected based on Alam in view of Maakipa.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants kindly request that the Examiner clarify the basis for the rejection of claims 11-16.

B. The Examiner has rejected claims 9, 10 and 17 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Alam et al. in view of Makipaa et al. and further in view of Thurlow et al. (U.S. 6,057,841).

Claims 9 and 10 depend from claim 1, and claim 17 depends from claim 11. Applicants respectfully submit that Thurlow fails to cure the deficiencies of Alam and Maakipa, as discussed above, with respect to claims 1 and 11. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 9, 10 and 11 are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency.

In addition, Applicants note that claim 9 recites the feature of a user input process rule change part containing a plurality of predetermined user input process rules applicable to the user input, said user input process rule change part operable to select one of the plurality of user input process rules according to the instruction from said rule change instruction part.

The Examiner recognizes that neither Alam nor Maakipa discloses or suggests such a feature. The Examiner, however, applies Thurlow and alleges that Thurlow cures this deficiency of Alam and Maakipa. Applicants respectfully disagree.

Thurlow discloses a system for processing electronic messages (e.g., e-mail) by applying user created rules for managing incoming and outgoing messages (see col. 9, lines 18-20). The user created rules are able to execute specific tasks when certain criteria regarding a message is met (see col. 9, lines 20-24).

For example, as shown in Tables I and II of Thurlow, a user may choose a condition, such as, “if body contains specific words” as well as an action, such as, “delete it” (see Tables I and II in col. 11 and 12, respectively). Accordingly, if such a rule is created, if the body of the message contains specific words chosen by the user, then the message will be automatically deleted.

Thus, while Thurlow discloses the ability to create rules based on user input, and process messages according to these rules, Applicants respectfully submit that the rules of Thurlow are not applicable to user input, but instead, are solely applicable to received messages. In other

words, while the rules of Thurlow apply to electronic messages, there is absolutely no disclosure in Thurlow which would suggest that the rules apply to user input, as recited in claim 9. By providing rules that are applicable to user input, it is possible to change the effect that a particular user input (e.g., an input from a keypad) will have on displayed information by changing the selected rule.

Further, as noted above, claim 9 recites that the user input process rule change part is operable to select one of the plurality of user input process rules according to the instruction from the rule change instruction part. As noted above in the discussion of claim 1, the Examiner has taken the position that the ability to set certain rules for dividing the format blocks of Alam, as described in col. 17, line 1 through col. 18, line 36, corresponds to a “rule change instruction part” for making an instruction (see Office Action at page 3).

Thus, the Examiner appears to be alleging that the rules for dividing format blocks, as taught by Alam, could somehow be combined with the ability to apply rules to electronic mail messages, as taught by Thurlow. Applicants respectfully submit that such a combination is improper.

Indeed, Applicants respectfully submit that even if Alam and Thurlow were somehow combined, the resulting combination, at best, would merely provide a system that has the ability to convert a document from an input format to an output format, as taught by Alam, as well as the ability to route electronic messages based on user created rules, as taught by Thurlow.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that the cited prior art fails to disclose, suggest or otherwise render obvious the feature of a user input process rule change part containing a plurality of predetermined user input process rules applicable to user input, wherein

the user input process rule change part is operable to select one the plurality of user input process rules according to the instruction from the rule change instruction part, as recited in claim 9.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that claim 9 is patentable over the cited prior art, an indication of which is kindly requested.

Further, regarding claims 11-16, to the extent that the Examiner intended to reject these claims based on Alam in view of Maakipa, and further in view of Thurlow, Applicants submit that independent claim 11 is patentable over the cited prior art for at least similar reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 9. Claims 12-17 depend from claim 11 and are therefore considered patentable at least by virtue of their dependency.

## **II. Conclusion**

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may best be resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Kiyoshi OGISHI et al.

By: *Kenneth W. Fields*  
Kenneth W. Fields  
Registration No. 52,430  
Attorney for Applicants

KWF/abm  
Washington, D.C. 20006-1021  
Telephone (202) 721-8200  
Facsimile (202) 721-8250  
June 2, 2005